

REMARKS

Applicants confirm the provisional election of Group I, claims 1-13, made by telephone on July 25, 2005.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1-13 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,587,156 ("Wdowik") in view of WO 02/087519 ("WO '519"). Claims 1-6 and 8-13 have also been rejected as unpatentable over US 2003/0124083 ("US '083") in view of WO '519. These rejections will be discussed in turn.

Wdowik in view of WO '519

Claim 1, as amended, features a method of shaving comprising applying to an area of skin a shaving composition that comprises, *inter alia*, water insoluble lubricating polymer particles and a water soluble polymer, present in a ratio of about 0.1 to about 10. Support for this ratio range is found on page 7, lines 10-11 of Applicants' specification.

Wdowik focuses entirely on the addition of particulate additives to shaving compositions. These particulate additives are said to provide microscopic support to the blade and act in conjunction with the blade to pull hair away from its follicle. (See col. 4, lines 19-27.) There is no indication that the addition of a water soluble polymer would assist with these objectives. Wdowik does not mention including a water-soluble polymer in his compositions except for in his examples, which include a very low level (0.12 %) of polyvinylpyrrolidone (PVP) in combination with a large quantity of nylon fibers (5%) or silica sand (3%). Thus, the only teaching regarding ratios of particulate additive to water-soluble polymer is found in the Examples, i.e., a ratio of 50:1.2 in Example 1 and 30:1.2 in Example 2. Moreover, Wdowik does not teach any compositions containing both PTFE particles and water-soluble polymer and, thus, does not provide any suggestion to make this combination let alone indicate a suitable ratio of these components.

WO '519 pertains solely to the addition of water soluble polymers, with no teaching of particulate additives, and thus does not supply any teaching regarding ratios of particulate additive to water soluble polymer. The artisan would have had no reason to believe that the amounts of water soluble polymer used in WO '519 would have been desirable in the compositions taught by Wdowik, and in fact Wdowik's use of very low levels of water soluble polymer would have suggested otherwise.

Nor is there any motivation that would have led the artisan to combine the teachings of these two references. Wdowik is concerned solely with using particulate additives to separate the blade from the skin surface, while WO '519 is directed solely to special combinations of water-soluble polymers. The artisan would have seen no reason to combine these teachings, which provide two different and diverse approaches to enhancing shaving.

Because neither reference provides any teaching of Applicants' claimed ratios, even if the teachings of Wdowik and WO '519 could be properly combined, which is not conceded, this combination would not have suggested Applicants' invention as now claimed.

US '083 in view of WO '519

US '083 teaches the use of either a water-based polymer or a PTFE lubricant, not both. Throughout the disclosure of US '083, including the claims (compare claims 1-8 vs. claims 9-11), there is no mention whatsoever of using water-based polymer and PTFE lubricant together in a single composition.

Thus, combining the teachings of US '083 with those of WO '519 would not result in Applicants' claimed compositions. Instead, it would result at most in the use of the special combinations of polymers described in WO '519 in place of the water-based polymers described in US '083 in compositions that lack PTFE lubricant.

Moreover, since neither reference teaches or suggests combining PTFE with a water soluble polymer, clearly neither reference teaches or suggests Applicants' claimed ratios.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

New Claim

New claim 32 has been added. This claim has the same scope as original claim 5 and thus does not raise new issues requiring further search. None of the cited references teach or suggest using 0.005 to 2% lubricating particles, comprising PTFE, in combination with a water soluble polymer. When Wdowik uses water soluble polymer at all – which is only in his examples – he uses much higher levels of particles (3% and 5%). The other references provide no suggestion whatsoever to combine water soluble polymer with a particulate additive, as discussed above. Thus it is submitted that new claim 32 is also patentable over the art of record.

Conclusion

Enclosed is a \$120 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 00216-643001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

December 1, 2005



Celia H. Leber
Reg. No. 33,524

Reg No 30,175

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906